

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed September 30, 2008 has been carefully considered. Within the Office Action Claims 34-35 and 37-38 have been rejected; and Claims 12-20 have been allowed. The Applicants have amended Claims 34 and have added new dependent claim 45. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Claims 34-35 and 37-38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over the combination of U.S. Patent No. 5,800,179 to Bailey and U.S. Patent No. 1,889,330 to Humes et al. (hereinafter “Humes”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Specifically, the Office Action contends that the elements of Claim 34 are disclosed in Bailey except that Bailey does not teach any details of a clamping apparatus. The Office Action further contends that Humes teaches the clamping apparatus and that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to incorporate Humes into Bailey in order to reach the subject matter in Claim 34. The Applicants respectfully disagree for the reasons set forth below.

Humes is directed to a screw holding attachment for screw drivers which automatically grasps and retains the screw with a plurality of jaws by actuating a lever device (sleeve) in response to the relative movement of the device and the screw. It is alleged in the office action that Humes automatically releases the screw in response to a second relative movement of the device and the screw. However, the combination of Humes and Bailey does not teach or suggest that the grasping member is configured to allow the peripheral device is be longitudinally inserted therein, as recited in Claim 34. Instead, the screw in Humes is inserted into the jaws 16

from the side. (Humes, Col. 2, Lines 61-64). Furthermore, the combination of Humes and Bailey does not teach or suggest that the grasping member is configured to automatically close around the peripheral device as the peripheral device longitudinally moves in the first movement and pushes a longitudinally moveable actuator at a second end of the grasping member initially in contact with the grasping member, as recited in Claim 34. Instead, Humes describes that the sleeve is moved downward over the screw to hold it in place. Considering that the combination of Bailey and Humes does not teach or suggest each and every element/limitation in Claim 34, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established. For at least these reasons, Claim 34 is non-obvious and thus patentable over the cited combination. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

It is believed that this reply places the above-identified patent application into condition for allowance. Early favorable consideration of this reply is earnestly solicited.

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, an interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the number indicated below.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Please charge any additional required fee or credit any overpayment not otherwise paid or credited to our deposit account No. 50-3557. A two month extension fee accompanies this reply.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 2, 2009

/Suvashis Bhattacharya/
Suvashis Bhattacharya
Reg. No. 46,554

Nixon Peabody LLP
200 Page Mill Road
2nd Floor
Palo Alto, CA 94306
Tel. (650) 320-7700
Fax (650) 320-7701